

M E E T I N G M I N U T E S

Meeting: Evergreen Visioning Project Meeting #7

Date: February 25, 2004

The seventh meeting of the Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force was held on February 25, 2004 at the Eastridge Mall Community Room at 7:00 PM.

Task Force Attendees: Councilmember Dave Cortese, Alan Covington (Charrette participant), Bill Kozlovsky, Chris Corpus (Charrette participant, KONA), Daniel Gould (Silver Creek Valley Country Club), Daniel Jacobs (Meadowlands), Gordon Lund (Groesbeck), Homing Yip (Evergreen Hills Resident Action Group), Lou Kvitek (Silver Creek Valley Community Organization), Maria Lopez (Charrette participant, Meadowfair), Mike Alvarado (Charrette participant), Paul Pereira (Boggini), Rick Caton (Charrette participant), Scott Nickle (Charrette participant), Sherry Gilmore (Charrette participant, Holly Oaks), Steve Tedesco (Charrette Participant, Boys & Girls Club), Tom Andrade (Charrette participant, EESD Superintendent), Victor Klee (Charrette Participant), Vikki Lang (Alternate, ELL), Vince Songcayawon (EBPA)

Members of the Public: Mike Hulme, Vivian Miranda

Development Community: Bo Radanovich, Mike Keaney, Dean Isaacs, Tom Armstrong, Joe Sordi, Steve Dunn, Gerry De Young, Mark Day, Andrey Bandrovsky, Patrick Spillane,

Staff: PBCE Deputy Director Laurel Prevetti, PBCE Senior Planner Britta Buys, Rabia Chaudhry, Bonnie Moss, Anh Nguyen, Ivy Serratt, John Weis, Norm Robbins, Mike Kelly, Amber Zunder

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Councilmember Cortese welcomed the group and explained that the meeting would begin with two presentations:

- ✍️ Thompson Creek Trail – this project is already on the amenities list but the task needed to be brought up to speed on the latest developments.
- ✍️ Mt. Pleasant Sports Complex - this project is for consideration as an addition to the amenities list.

II. THOMPSON CREEK TRAIL & FOWLER CREEK PARK

Citywide Trails Coordinator Yves Zsutty gave a brief overview on the masterplanning process for Thompson Creek Trail. This trail runs approximately seven miles, originating at Lake Cunningham Regional Park and terminating on San Felipe Road at Heartland Way. The proposed trail alignment has been divided into four segments:
Reach 1 – Lake Cunningham Regional Park to Aborn Road

Reach 2 – Aborn Road to Yerba Buena Road

Reach 3 – Yerba Buena Road to Larkspur Canyon Road

Reach 4 – Larkspur Canyon Road to Heartland Way

Staff considered various factors when proposing the trail alignment including land within public ownership, proximity to creek, topographic suitability, environmental impact, etc. As a result three alternatives for the alignment have been developed: interim (short-term), intermediate (involves minimal land acquisition) and long-term (involves more land acquisition).

Each reach of the trail presents opportunities and constraints:

Reach 1 – much of this runs along Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) channels. As the city of San Jose has a collaborative agreement with SCVWD for trail development, there are opportunities here to beautify the alignment.

Reach 2 – existing land uses are close to creek, making this a difficult portion of the trail. There are two possible routes here, either continuing along San Felipe Road or utilizing Yerba Buena Avenue.

Reach 3 – this reach exists amidst a natural environment and there may be opportunities here based on private property owners' plans to develop.

Reach 4 – there is an existing trail here already. Do we keep it as is or attempt to expand?

Zsutty explained that the Thompson Creek Trail masterplan is being developed right now and a final community meeting will be held in May. Once that occurs the environmental impact assessment can begin.

Zsutty gave a brief overview on Fowler Creek Park. He explained that it is a 12-acre park that shall be constructed over a period of years to produce various amenities including a swim center comprised of two pools, small community center, garden and fountain area, playground and tot lot, water play area for children, tennis courts and practice wall, family picnic areas, group picnic areas, bocce ball courts, open turf area and other natural features. The construction of these amenities shall occur in phases and according to the funds available. Phase I shall consist mostly of the landscaping items. Zsutty then entertained questions from the task force on Thompson Creek Trail and Fowler Creek Park.

Task force member Sherry Gilmore commented that crossing Quimby and Tully Roads (with respect to Thompson Creek Trail) seemed perilous and asked if there was a possibility of doing above/below grade crossings. Zsutty replied that the SCVWD has commented that this would be difficult but that he would ask San Jose Department of Transportation staff about doing other road improvements in these areas.

Task force member Mike Alvarado commented that public transit hubs should be incorporated into the masterplan and Zsutty agreed.

Task force member Lou Kvitek asked if trail construction was prioritized by reach. Zsutty responded that the trail was divided into segments simply to better handle the community process.

Task force member Homing Yip asked why the community center in the Fowler Creek Park masterplan is not being constructed as part of phase I. Both Zsutty and Cortese responded that the cost of constructing the center is very high and would exceed the five

million dollars that has currently accrued via homeowner assessment. Furthermore, even if the funds to construct the center were available, the city is not in a financial position at this time to support the operation/maintenance of the center. Task force member Maria Lopez asked if the Thompson Creek meetings were open to the public and Zsutty responded yes.

Task force member Alan Covington asked about the current funding for the trail. Cortese responded that funds exist just for the creation of the masterplan and the development of the environmental impact report (EIR). Zsutty added that with the completion of these two documents, we'll be in a good position to go after grants.

III. MOUNT PLEASANT SPORTS COMPLEX

Ivy Serratt explained that the Mount Pleasant Elementary School District has had plans to construct a gymnasium complex on Flint Avenue in North Evergreen, between August Boeger Junior High School and Foothill Intermediate School. This plan will include athletic facilities for school and community use as well as community meeting and office space and a technology lab. The school district would like this facility to be joint use by the city and the community by way of offering classes and making available the community meeting spaces. Also, while the school district will be focusing their construction on the complex itself, they have included in their overall layout the design of soccer and little league fields.

Kvitek asked what about the definition of an intermediate school and Serratt explained that this type of school serves fourth, fifth and sixth graders.

Cortese clarified that the little league predominant in this area is the East Hills Little League, not the Evergreen Little League.

Alvarado asked which of the programs/classes offered at the proposed complex will be fee based. Serratt explained that while the school district probably will not charge, the city might. Cortese stated that at the next Task Force meeting, we'll distribute copies of the current fee schedule for city classes/programs. He also said we'll formally consider this project, along with Thompson Creek Trail, for inclusion to our amenities list, at the next Task Force Meeting.

IV. LAND USE CONCEPTS

Cortese explained that the property owners have been attending these meetings recently to learn about the community's opinions and concerns with respect to development in Evergreen. Some of these owners represent substantial holdings. A few had begun the process of applying for permits to develop their land when Cortese asked them to consider coming forward together so all of the properties in Evergreen could be developed in tandem. Therefore we are now at the point to begin discussion on each property, where it is, how it relates to greater Evergreen, how to apply the Guiding Principles to proposed development, etc. The property owners will listen to the comments and return to subsequent meetings with renderings of various options. The only exception to this process is the Arcadia Property. Because it was the focus of a charrette in November 2002, there is already a vision with which to work. Cortese listed the major properties currently in play:

-
1. Berg Property – approximately 173 acres
 2. IDS Property – approximately 20 acres
 3. Legacy Property – approximately 120 acres
 4. Arcadia Property – approximately 80 acres

In addition there is the Dade Behring property, which is owned by Deutsche Bank and currently on the market for 45 million dollars.

LEGACY: When Legacy Properties realized they could not pursue campus industrial development on their property, they decided to file a general plan amendment for a different designation. They met with a core group of the Evergreen Hills Resident Action Group (EHRAG) and talked with them about potential density and traffic impacts on this site. They were to return to EHRAG with responses but instead decided to work with the Evergreen Smart Growth Strategy. Cortese asked the Task Force to bear in mind that Legacy had full rights to pursue with developing campus industrial and would not have to mitigate for traffic. Instead, they've agreed to consider a residential use and perhaps expand the Evergreen Specific Plan to this area. Cortese asked the Task Force what they thought of this. Should Legacy Properties come to the 3/10/04 meeting with options on what an extension/variation of the ESP could look like on this property, keeping in mind the objectives the task force would like met (guiding principles and amenities)?

Gilmore asked for a definition of the designation "campus industrial." PBCE Deputy Director Laurel Prevetti explained that it refers to high end research/development parks. The city created the campus industrial designation to imply that these areas should have a higher standard of art and architecture.

Task force member Rick Caton asked if smaller maps that zeroed in on the opportunity sites could be made available and Prevetti said yes.

Alvarado asked if housing prices would go up to cover developer costs for constructing the amenities. Cortese responded that we don't yet know the end costs of the homes. Once we've knitted ideas together, we can then figure out how much each developer will contribute to the facilities district, how much can be justified in terms of quality of life, etc. We'll then be in a better place to answer this question. We'll also ask the developers to be as candid as they can in terms of economics.

Kvitek commented that the task force cannot forget the importance of planning for Evergreen schools when considering potential land uses of these opportunity sites. Cortese agreed and stated that some developers may prefer to give land versus money to the facilities district and this would be particularly relevant to the issue of schools.

Tedesco asked if what is under consideration is converting the entire Legacy property to residential/retail and if the developers will come back with options under this scenario. If yes, this will drive whatever other features are added to the site and he cautioned the group to avoid a repeat of the Midtown development situation. He also said the task force needs to decide what density this property could support. Cortese mentioned that EHRAG feels the density on this property should not exceed what is currently within the ESP.

Tedesco commented that he feels the development here should be feathered – add like buildings to enable a smooth transition. He doesn't see any of the proposed amenities

fitting in here. He also does not want the developer to come back only with options that are currently within the ESP.

Yip volunteered that there are varying densities within the ESP. Cortese added that we can consider a separate trip to this area so people can better understand it.

Gilmore asked what would happen if the CI zoning was left in place. Are there businesses currently interested in occupying this land? Can the San Jose City Council approve a rezoning even if the community wants it to remain as such? Shouldn't the CI zoning be left in place to encourage the development a reverse commute workplace? Cortese responded by giving background as to the current CI designation. He said it was zoned as such to create a southbound work commute because presumably residents in the area would work there. This designation occurred because the City converted some property in Berryessa from CI to residential and this Evergreen property from residential to CI. The concern now is that this property is too far east to effectively house businesses and draw residents into a reverse commute. However, we don't want to lose our employment or tax base, either.

Kvitek commented that he feels this property should be re-designated. The creation of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan will draw out more employment opportunities.

Gilmore commented that she preferred for the land to remain as open space. Cortese pointed out that that's fine, but under the CI designation, there is no requirement to mitigate.

Kvitek commented that it would be nice if all three property owners (IDS, Legacy and Berg) would work together and present a cohesive development plan.

Task force member Tom Andrade pointed out that by changing the designation to residential, there will be an impact to schools. School planning has occurred along the assumption that this property is not residential. He also asked if what is occurring here is a part II of the Evergreen Specific Plan, where developers plan together. He proposes this path.

Tedesco reiterated that he does not want the developers tied to Evergreen Specific Plan densities when coming back with options for this site. Higher densities will allow for more amenities to be constructed. Cortese responded that the developers will come back with scenarios of varying densities.

Yip said that the Evergreen Specific Plan is well balanced with a range of densities and development on this property should occur in a similar fashion, particularly because this land is smaller.

Alvarado said that there are design principles that should be applied to these scenarios, such as grouping higher densities around colleges.

Cortese offered that if the group is considering adding retail here that we will have to demonstrate a market share with preexisting businesses in the area.

Task force member Gordon Lund commented that he feels the traffic situation would be better if the CI designation was not changed. Cortese responded that that is true only if the infrastructure remains the same. Any land use re-designation that occurs here needs to be accompanied by a valid traffic analysis that shows that the proposed traffic improvements can support the planned re-use. Lund agreed, but asked to see traffic analysis if the CI designation remains.

Member of the public Vivian Miranda asked for an explanation of the re-designation process. Cortese responded that re-designations are entertained during the General Plan Amendment hearings and are entirely open to the public. He asked the group to continue thinking about this overall issue and offer comments via the yahoo group. He reminded the group to be respectful of each other's contributions and not attack.

V. NEXT STEPS

The meeting adjourned at 9:05pm.